



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are far from being radical, yet they are only the most recent among biblical theologians who find themselves driven from different sides to this position.

Finally, one finds oneself in substantial agreement with the results rather than with the methods of Mr. Shaw's good-humored discussion (pp. 63-84) of the Dutch school. The recent prominence of this criticism has given it quite a fictitious importance, but if these cloud-compellers, or rather children of the mist, are worth direct notice, the campaign will require to proceed from some ampler and more scientific base of operations than that afforded in the main by an acquaintance with van Manen's English lucubrations and some English discussion of the same topic. Otherwise, Mr. Shaw's reading has been wide and fairly thorough. But it is not hypercritical, I trust, to regret the absence of any allusion to so satisfying a book as Haupt's edition of the prison epistles (in Meyer), or to Principal Drummond's scrappy but suggestive little volume in the "International Handbooks" series. And, in pointing his moral or adorning his tale at several points, Mr. Shaw might have drawn upon Martineau's vivid pages instead of upon — well, some lesser writers who are very much in evidence!

DUNDONALD, SCOTLAND.

JAMES MOFFATT.

JUDAISM IN THE DAYS OF JESUS.

IT has become customary to designate that period of the religion of Israel which is bounded at the one end by the Maccabean uprising and at the other by the disastrous struggle with Rome which crushed out Jewish national life in Palestine as "Late Judaism"—*Spätjudentum*. "Judaism," in a historical sense, is a term applicable only to the post-exilic phase of the religion of Israel; perhaps it may be said to begin with the act of 621. In contrast with the pre-exilic phase or Yahwism, which was a national religion, that is to say, the religion of a nation enjoying political life, Judaism may be characterized as the religion of a community developing into a church. While "Early" or pre-Maccabean Judaism is essentially concerned with the life of the small Jewish community shut in by the walls of Jerusalem, and playing the part of a mere onlooker while round about nations rage and kingdoms are moved, the later period displays volume, expansiveness, aggressiveness, and organization which all go toward the making of a church. Of the literature in which the spiritual movements of Late Judaism are recorded the single blank page between the Old Testament and the New in our English

Bible gives but scant evidence. The so-called apocryphal and pseud-epigraphic writings of the Old Testament are conveniently accessible in Kautzsch's German Bible (1900); to which should be added Philo, Josephus, and the older strata of the Mishna. The voice of prophecy is silent; psalm-writing is in its last stages; the stirring events of the day find painstaking, though sometimes interested, reporters; the Jewish religion is glorified and presented in the right light; wisdom makes herself heard; while the tradition of the elders is still handed down by mouth from master to pupil, numerous visionaries are busy revealing the mysteries of heaven. The official guardians of the religion, they who sit in the seat of Moses, are the teachers of the Law, those jurists so severely castigated in the gospels, yet counting as their own Hillel and Gamaliel. While Jewish piety in its periphery manifests itself in a variety of externals—in fasting, the washing of hands, the cleansing of vessels, the keeping away from forbidden food, and the scrupulous tithing of mint and anise and cummin—in its center it signifies an earnest and holy desire to do God's will; and the shortest, yet most comprehensive, formula in which the doctors are wont to sum it up—it won the approbation of Jesus (Mark 12:34)—is “the taking upon oneself of the yoke of the sovereignty of God” (קבלת עול מלכות שמים).

So near the gospel, and yet so far from it! Such is the verdict of a Wellhausen, a Harnack. The seven woes upon the hypocrite scribes and Pharisees ring in the ears of every Christian theologian; the Pauline estimate of the Law does the rest. The polemical tone of the gospels should warn a fair-minded student that there may lurk in those unsparing criticisms a bit of one-sided exaggeration; but the warning is quite often forgotten. It were idle to deny that Jesus sought to transcend the piety of the average representative of Pharisaism; I doubt whether he wished to destroy the whole system as worthless. It is a favorite undertaking to contrast the religion of Jesus and that of the Pharisees. A contrast there exists in all truth; it is the same that offsets the radicalism of Jeremiah (4:3a) against the compromises of the men of Deuteronomy (Jer. 4:3b; 3:5b; 8:8), or the religion of Tolstoi against that of the representatives of the Russian church. The prophet is always at variance with his time; he is impatient with the circuitous roads by which alone communities may be led to the service of God; he disdains to avail himself of such crude methods as he finds in current use in order to infuse his ideal into the hearts of men. The prophet's religion is truly his own. He must needs assume an inimical attitude toward organized piety, that is, toward ecclesiasticism. Jewish

piety in the times of Jesus showed the blessings, but also the evils, of all ecclesiasticism. Jesus emphasized its evils. That was his task as a prophet. Therein is grounded the contrast between his piety and that of Jewish officialdom. Bousset, the *Privatdocent*, discussed in 1892 the preaching of Jesus in its contrast to Judaism; in his work on "The Jewish Religion in New Testament Times,"¹ which, mature in judgment and as a professor, he has now given to the world, he concedes that, in his previous effort, he "emphasized in too one-sided a manner the contrast between Jewish piety and that of the gospel."

"'Aḥad ha-'am" (A. Ginzberg), S. Bernfeld, and others of the Zionist camp will hardly dispute Bousset's thesis of the ecclesiastical character of early rabbinism, although the national limitations, which Bousset naturally considers as a defect, will be seized upon by them as evidences of the supremacy of an undying national assertiveness. From another camp, which, it seems, has not emancipated itself from the Mendelssohnian conception of the undogmatic character of Judaism, there has actually come the contention that Bousset has overestimated the importance which, in the religious system of rabbinic Judaism, was attached to articles of faith or to faith in general.² I believe that Bousset's thesis cannot be shaken. Whether in Palestine or in the dispersion, the Jews of the post-Maccabean period faced the world as members of a religious organization, of a church in its beginnings. I say with Bousset, *in its beginnings*, although he and I will differ as to where the consummation is to be placed. For him the consummation lies in the Christian church; for me, in the Christian church on the one hand, but, on the other, also in mediæval Judaism and the Reformed Jewish church of our own days. Bousset's use of the word "church" for the Jewish religious body in New Testament times is to be commended; it is not only expressive—how cumbersome and vague is the term "religious community"!—but, above all, historically correct; witness the rabbinic expression: כְּנֶסֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, "the church of Israel." Jewish nationalism is modern. Its causes need not be discussed here. But, so far as the past is concerned, Judaism represents a body of doctrines for which alone, individually and collectively, the Jew suffered martyrdom, and the organization of the Jewish communities, with the discipline it involved, was strictly ecclesiastical.

Bousset is particularly attracted by the eschatology of late Judaism,

¹*Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* Von WILHELM BOUSSET. Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1903. Pp. xiv + 512.

²See PERLES, *Bousset's Religion des Judentums kritisch untersucht*, 1903.

in which he discerns a twofold and somewhat contradictory aspect. The hopes which have the establishment of the kingdom of God and the Jewish people in Jerusalem, and the subjugation of the heathen world for their subject are called by him Messianic; while the hopes which center about a transcendent world and a heavenly Jerusalem are termed by him apocalyptic. The two sets of hopes are not clearly differentiated, but fuse into each other to produce a peculiar tangle. Occasionally it is sought to bring order into the confused ideas; hence the doctrine of chiliasm. A dualistic conception of the world underlies the apocalyptic hopes: this world is evil and the evil one's; the world which is to come will be good and God's own world. Bousset finds in the presence of the apocalyptic hopes, based as they are upon a dualistic view of the world, a problem which needs accounting for. The apocalyptic ideas do not appear to him to be derivable from Jewish premises, but necessitate the assumption of foreign, particularly Parsist, influence. To this question the concluding pages are devoted. The problem and the answer have been presented by Bousset also in a popular booklet.³ Whether Bousset is quite successful with his derivation of Jewish eschatology from the Persian may perhaps be a matter of doubt; at all events, Baldensperger's remark⁴ just with reference to these supposed foreign mutations in Judaism deserves to be widely known:

There is this difference in the point of view of different investigators: the theologian says, "There exist foreign elements in Judaism, but they have been transformed;" the historian, "The foreign elements in Judaism have indeed been transformed, but they exist nevertheless."

Religions borrow ideas, as languages borrow words; and just as words become naturalized and in their transformation hardly recognizable as loanwords, so it is with religious ideas: they become transformed, fuse with the indigenous religion, become an integral part of its system. And, furthermore, it may be proper for the theologian who speaks for the living church to say whether a supposedly foreign doctrine fits in with the rest or not; the historian should be above the "disharmonies" between the old and the new, the native and the foreign. But the historical coolness frequently makes way for a theological "value-judgement."

I do not wish here to take sides in the contention between Bousset and his rather severe critic, Perles. Bousset has answered in a brochure

³ *Die jüdische Apokalypitik, ihre religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft und ihre Bedeutung für das neue Testament*, 1903.

⁴ *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judenthums* (1903), p. 194.

entitled *Volksfrömmigkeit und Schriftgelehrtentum*. Thus much is to be said: Bousset's too scrupulous regard for contemporaneous evidence deprives him of the use of the vast material stored up in the anonymous aggada. The historian should never be economical with his sources; he need never be afraid of having too many. And where his sources are not datable, they may be treated as late; but then, on the basis of them, an attempt ought to be made to reconstruct the past. A judicious perusal of the rabbinic literature would have been profitable. Of course, the subject is comprehensive, and the scholar combining the knowledge of the rabbinic literature with that of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic writings as well as the New Testament, all at first hand, is yet to come. Meanwhile let us thank Bousset for his contribution. I am sorry that, on p. 10 of his reply, Bousset has allowed himself to be carried away by polemics to assert that the world would have been no loser if rabbinic Judaism had not existed. His statement that Christianity was of itself capable of restoring true monotheism where it had been perverted may be questioned. The Hebrew Bible preserved by the Jews, not to mention other influences, was a factor in the Christian Reformation; and the preservation of the church of Israel to this day should, to a believer in divine providence, be evidence that the religion of love may still be in need of a corrective through the religion of law.

MAX L. MARGOLIS.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

No New Testament scholar is properly equipped for his work today who is not, at least, fairly well acquainted with the period covered by Bousset in the book before us—with its dominant ideas and tendencies, if not with its literature in detail. Incompetent interpreters used to be reproved for not reading individual texts in the light of the immediate context. Then biblical theology came and taught us that the real context of any passage is the whole scope and content of the book in which it occurs. Then this conception of "context" was extended to the whole circle of a given author's ideas, and a comparison with the usage and thought of other canonical writers was regarded as important. Now we are taught to read the New Testament in the larger "context" of the world of ideas within which it arose. This requirement is just and necessary. There can be no adequate historical study of New Testament literature and theology which does not take account of that special and peculiar world of thought and feeling in

which the first teachers of the Christian religion were reared and trained. The more clearly this has been seen, the more eager and thorough has been the study of those Jewish and Alexandrian worlds of thought which immediately preceded or were contemporary with the New Testament period. In this field the Germans have led the way, and it is safe to say that the historical study of the beginnings of our religion is now more largely occupied with this than with any other single interest. To this study the work of Bousset is one of the most important contributions. In its range it covers, roughly speaking, two centuries, from about 170 B. C. to 40 A. D.; that is, from the period of the Antiochan persecutions and the Maccabean war to the death of Philo.

As it is quite impossible within the limits of a brief notice to review this elaborate work in detail, I will select for brief comment the author's treatment of a few points of special interest to students of the New Testament. On the question whether late Judaism had a doctrine of the pre-existence of the Messiah, Bousset agrees, in general, with Dalman, that this idea was not native to Jewish thought. Nevertheless, he finds evidence—somewhat sporadic, indeed—of its existence. The Septuagint translation shows traces of the idea, in such passages as Ps. 109:3; Isa. 9:6, and especially, in the passage of chief importance, Dan. 7:13. In the similitudes of the book of Enoch the pre-existence of the *name* of the Messiah is emphasized, but this phrase is but a periphrasis for the Messiah himself. In 4 Ezra also the Messiah is conceived as a pre-existent heavenly being.

Whence, then, if this idea was naturally foreign to Jewish thought, did it come in the cases noted? The answer usually given is that it arose from a misunderstanding of the symbolic description of Israel in Dan. 7:13 as "one like unto a son of man." This phrase, it is said, was taken in a personal sense, and thus the title "Son of Man," as applied to the Messiah, and the conception of his heavenly pre-existence are alike explained. This explanation is the more plausible since the references to Messiah's pre-existence in Enoch and 4 Ezra seem to be echoes of this Danielic passage. Says Bousset:

Nevertheless, this explanation seems to me in the highest degree improbable. That so important and influential an idea as that of a heavenly, pre-existent Messiah should have arisen simply from a misunderstanding of a biblical text is absolutely inconceivable. . . . Rather is the idea connected, in the tradition, in the closest manner with the Messianic title "Son of Man." It is found only where this title is found.

But after recognizing certain difficulties which render this explanation by itself insufficient, the author concludes :

We are forced to the conjecture that in this figure of the pre-existent Son of Man two forms are blended: the Jewish Messiah, and a pre-existent heavenly being whose origin and derivation are still unexplained. The idea of a heavenly, original man in some form is combined with the Jewish Messianic idea.

In any case, Bousset concludes, the idea had a wide vogue and influence. He further thinks that the title "Son of Man" as a designation of the Messiah was more common than it is generally believed to have been. He differs from those who deny Jesus' application of the title "Son of man" to himself, and says of this explanation which has been so energetically supported by Wellhausen, Lietzmann, *et al.* :

The assumption that the title "Son of Man" first arose on Greek soil through a misunderstanding of Dan. 7:13 appears to be impossible (pp. 250-54).

Another theme of obvious interest to students of the New Testament receives a brief, but illuminating treatment: the vicarious sufferings of the righteous. This conception had already found striking expression in the exilic Isaiah. The synagogue elaborated it, especially in developing the doctrine of a "treasury of merit" accumulated by the sufferings of the good which might be drawn upon by the unworthy. Bousset shows how the sufferings of the martyrs in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes were viewed in this light. Their death is an *ἱλαστήριος θάνατος*. One of the seven brothers prays that by their sufferings the divine wrath may be averted from their race. Another prays: "Be gracious to thy people, and let the sufferings which we are enduring for their sake suffice thee. Let my blood serve as a purification; take my life as a substitute for their life." These examples are from 2 Maccabees. Similar thoughts appear elsewhere, as when Josephus represents Abraham as expecting to derive benefit from the undeserved sufferings of Isaac. The merits of the saints were regarded as a protection from calamity and punishment. The presence of even one or two righteous men in a city was held to be a guaranty of safety.

These are mere isolated illustrations selected with a view to showing the interest which the book possesses for the student who wishes to pursue the study of the New Testament in a historical method. The time has gone when the study of our primitive Christian documents can be prosecuted in isolation. Grammar and exegesis have all the importance which they ever had, but they are no longer adequate.

Primitive Christianity is rooted in Jewish soil. Without some knowledge of that soil it cannot be historically understood, either in its kinship to, or difference from, the religion from which it sprang.

The plan of the work is very comprehensive. It includes a treatment of the sources, the development of Jewish piety, the national character of the Jewish religion, the theology of Judaism, and such collateral movements as the philosophy of Philo and the cult of the Essenes.

GEORGE B. STEVENS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THE VINDICATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

THIS essay^{*} is described by its author as an attempt "to enter completely into the modern view of the world and show that Christian truth remains;" "for Protestant Christianity cannot consent to become the religion of the ignorant and the thought-weary." The course of Professor Knox's argument is as follows:

The "direct and fundamental proofs" of the Christian religion change with changing views of the world. A classic line of argument is formed when a common world-view has for some continuous period of time held the field, and when Christian thought has definitely adjusted itself to it. Defendants and opponents of Christianity at such a time alike avail themselves of common intellectual instruments, and the issue of the contest is decided by the applicability of the instruments to the situation and by the skill with which they are handled. Such an argument was formulated by Bishop Butler in his *Analogy*, and such a situation was common to orthodox and heterodox in the great Deistic controversy of the seventeenth century. Miracles, the ontological, cosmological, teleological arguments for the existence of God, design, natural *versus* revealed knowledge, etc., constituted the problems of the classic argument. All this has been changed by the development and promulgation of modern thought. Miracles as infringements of natural laws are scientific inconceivabilities: as phenomena obeying peculiar natural laws, they have no apologetic value. Kant dealt the three classic arguments for the existence of God crushing blows. That from design has been relegated to the limbo prepared for antiquated notions. Common consent has been overthrown as a question of fact, and it is seen to be worthless even if it were true. Truth

^{*} *The Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion.* By GEORGE WILLIAM KNOX. New York: Scribner, 1903. 197 pages. \$1.20.